DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 159 317 CE 015 200

AUTHOR Milliken, W. James; Whaples, Gene C.
TITLE Implications of Work Values to Job Satisfaction in the Maryland Cooperative Extension Service.
PUB DATE Apr 78
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Adult Education Research Conference (San Antonio, Texas, April 5-7, 1978); Not available in hard copy because of faint, broken type in the original; For a related document see CE 015 182

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Personnel; Agricultural Education; Extension Agents; Field Studies; Individual Development; *Job Satisfaction; Motivation; Organizational Climate; Personal Values; *Professional Personnel; Promotion (Occupational); *Psychological Patterns; Questionnaires; Salaries; Sex Differences; Specialists; Supervisors; *Values; *Work Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS County Extension Agents Job Satisfaction Inventory; Herzberg (Frederick); Values for Working

ABSTRACT

A study was done to determine if work values of the Maryland Cooperative Extension Service faculty were related to Herzberg's job satisfaction elements. The design was ex post facto, exploratory field research. Subjects included 273 extension faculty members. A mail questionnaire composed of Hughes and Flowers' "Values for Working" and an adaptation of Calloway's County Extension Agents Job Satisfaction Inventory received 93.3% responses. Analysis revealed differences in work value system orientation and job satisfaction level and a relationship between work values and job satisfaction. Work value means were as follow: existential, 30.92; sociocentric, 19.95; manipulative 15.83; conformist, 15.71; tribalistic, 10.24; and egocentric 3.30. Factor analysis of job satisfaction indicated eight factors contributing to variance: achievement, supervision, salary, reporting, responsibility, advancement, recognition, and working conditions. The highly egocentric group was significantly less satisfied with the job and two Herzberg factors: working conditions and recognition. Those higher in sociocentrism were more satisfied with the salary factor but not with the job. Males scored higher on manipulative, conformist, and tribalistic values. Females scored higher on existential and sociocentric values. Higher age and years of experience were related to conformist values and job satisfaction. Educational level and behavioral science coursework were related to sociocentric, conformist, manipulative, and existential values. (See CE 015 182 for more detailed report.) (CSS/Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED159317

IMPLICATIONS OF WORK VALUES TO JOB SATISFACTION IN THE MARYLAND COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Gene C. Whaples

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

W. JAMES MILLIKEN
COUNTY CHAIRMAN, COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
COLLEGE PARK

GENE C. WHAPLES
ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL
AND
EXTENSION EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
COLLEGE PARK

The authors are indebted to Dr. Einar R. Ryden, Dr. Clifford L. Nelson, Dr. V. Allan Bandel, Dr. James W. Longest, Dr. Elwyn E. Deal, Dr. Bruce W. Sorter and Dr. Ed Reeves for their suggestions.

Gratitude is expressed to Dr. Jeffrey Owings for help with the statistics and computer programs.

Appreciation is also expressed to Dr. Charles L. Hughes and to Dr. Vincent S. Flowers for their permission to use the Values for Working questionnaire and many valuable suggestions for the study. In addition, Dr. Pauline Frances Calloway is thanked for her permission to use the County Extension Agents' Job Satisfaction Inventory.

PRESENTED AT THE
1978 ADULT EDUCATION RESEARCH CONFERENCE
APRIL 5-7
SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS

CE 015 280

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to determine if work values held by the faculty of the Maryland Cooperative Extension Service were related to Herzberg's elements of job satisfaction.

The study design was ex post facto, exploratory field research. The subjects were the total (273) Maryland Cooperative Extension Service faculty. A mail questionnaire was administered with 96.3% response.

Instruments used were Values For Working, copyrighted instrument of Hughes and Flowers and Adaption of Calloway's (1968) County Extension Agents Job Satisfaction Inventroy. Data were analyzed using factor analysis and chi square test of association between work values, job satisfaction and demographic data.

Analysis revealed there were differences in work value system orientation and level of job satisfaction, and a relationship between work values and job satisfaction.

Means of work values systems were: existential, 30,92; sociocentric, 19.95; manipulative 15.83; conformist, 15.71; tribalistic, 10.24; and egocentric, 3.30.

Factor analysis of the job satisfaction inventory indicated eight factors contributing to variance: acnievement, supervision, salary, reporting, responsibility, advancement, recognition, and working conditions.

Those faculty in the highly egocentric group were significantly less satisfied with the job and Herzberg factors, working conditions, and recognition.

Those faculty higher in sociocentrism were more satisfied with the salary factor but not with the job.

Male faculty were higher in manipulative, conformist and tribalistic values. Female faculty were higher in existential and sociocentric values.

Higher age and years of experience were related to conformist values and satisfaction with the job.

Educational level and behavioral science coursework were related to sociocentric, conformist, manipulative and existential values.

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

Annual recruitment to keep all positions filled and the disruption of programs from turnovers is one of the major problems of the Cooperative Extension Service.

The Cooperative Extension Service is staffed with agents and specialists of diverse background, training, interests, values and attitudes. Achieving organizational goals involves channeling and managing the diverse human resources and their individual values.

All organizations have goals either traditional or explicit through a management by objectives system. The goals of the organization relate to the values and psychological needs of the personnel. Not only do goals of the organization and individual values and needs sometimes conflict, but satisfaction of the workers may suffer when administrative values and goals conflict with those of the individual worker.

Management research shows that the goals, procedures and styles of leadership within most organizations are determined by managers of similar value systems.[1] If organizational goals are determined by administrators or managers with value systems incompatible with employees, alienation of employees and job dissatisfaction may result.

Research in industry has been directed toward isolating and defining the characteristics of dissatisfied workers and the factors that influence job satisfaction. Studies indicate that some aspects of the job may lead to satisfaction while others lead to dissatisfaction.

Differences among individuals account for varying degrees of influence among the factors of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. The total satisfaction or dissatisfaction may vary from period to period or as a result of changes in job content. Individual differences may be related to the value orientation of the individual and the relationship of that individual to others in his work group with different value systems.

Specifically, this study was concerned with establishing benchmark data for future job satisfaction and management studies and possible administrative policies to fit people to the jobs and the organization, and thus alleviate those conditions leading to employee dissatisfaction.

By the very nature of the organization, Cooperative Extension is unique. It's an agency "charged with responsibility in adult and youth education, without any compulsory hold on its clientele."[2] Agents and specialists are dispersed throughout the state, usually without any direct contact with supervision. To be successful the agent must be a self-starter, or in Maslow's terms, a "self-actualizer."

Amend ties dissatisfaction in work to performance:

> A dissatisfied person, performing inadequately on the job, is a waste to himself and his organization. The goal of personnel administration should be to properly place individuals for maximum utilization of their capabilities.[3]

Available evidence[4] indicates that Extension workers have an altruistic value of work; however, they are influenced in their decision to work for Extension and the satisfaction they achieve from work by the same financial, security and other job satisfaction factors as everyone else.

While the stated values of the Extension Service focus on service to clientele and benefits to clientele from programs, the efficient delivery of these programs is a function of the motivation and satisfaction of the individual worker in Extension, each with his or her own value orientation toward work.[5]

REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE

Kurt Baier states:

> "It is...generally recognized that in the determination of people's behavior their values play an important role and that the direction in which values change importantly affects the welfare of individuals and of societies."[6]

Value research is reported as "gloomy" by Baier, who states that:

> "Empirical investigators do not have available to them a conceptual apparatus suitable even for specifying the values, value systems, or value orientation of particular individuals or societies, at any given time, or changes in these values taking place over a period of time, let along any theories predicting and explaining such changes, and least of all any understanding of how to assess the desirability or understanding of any anticipated changes in such values."[7]

There have been attempts, however, to systematize value orientation into theory.

Rokeach makes the distinction that a value is:

> ...an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence.[8]

A number of values interacting and influencing the behavior of an individual are often referred to as a value system.

Research by Hughes et al[9] integrates the theories of Herzberg[10] and Graves[11] into a theory and structure of values that form a framework for this investigation of work-related values and for strategies to enhance the goals of the organization as well as the goals and satisfaction of the employee.

Theoretical Basis for Study

The theoretical framework upon which this study was based includes Maslow's motivation theory, the levels of existence theory of Clare Graves, Frederick Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory, and the work values concept of management as developed by Hughes, Flowers, et al, from Graves' theory.

Hughes and Flowers modified Graves' system of eight known levels of existence to a system of seven levels of work values. They offer a brief description of these values systems. (Table 1)

Hughes and Flowers' research indicates that job satisfaction is lowered when there is a mismatch of values of employees with those of supervision.[12]

They state:

> Traditionally and currently, managers with a single value system determine the goals of the organization. Further, the value system of the managers determines the systems and procedures and styles of leadership used to manage employees who are likely to have disparate value systems...[13]

Disparate value systems are those in which conflict and dissatisfaction may occur among employees when administration and supervision or the operational organizational value systems are centered at certain other levels.

Table 1. Values for Working as Theorized by Hughes and Flowers

Values for Working

The following categorizations of psychological levels of development and work values are based on Scott and Susan Myers' adaptation of Clare Graves's theory.

Level 1 - Reactive. This level of psychological development is restricted primarily to infants, people with serious brain deterioration, and certain psychopathic conditions. For practical purposes, employees are not ordinarily found at Level 1.

Level 2 - Tribalistic. These employees are best suited to jobs that offer easy work, friendly people, fair play, and, above all, a good boss. An employee at this level believes that he may not have the best job in the world, but he does as well as others with jobs like his. He likes a boss who tells him exactly what to do and how to do it, and who encourages him by doing it with him.

Level 3 - Egocentric. The two major requirements of a job for this employee are that it pay well and keep people off his back. He does not care for any kind of work that ties him down, but he will do it if he must in order to get some money. Because of the raw, rugged value system of this employee, he needs a boss who is tough, but allows him to be tough too.

Level 4 - Conformist. This employee likes a job which is secure, where the rules are followed, and no favoritism is shown. He feels that he has worked hard for what he has and thinks he deserves some good breaks. Others, he believes, should realize that it is their duty to work. He likes a boss who calls the shots, isn't always changing his mind, and sees to it that everyone follows the rules.

Level 5 - Manipulative. The ideal job for this employee is one which is full of variety, allows some free wheeling and dealing, and offers pay and bonus on the basis of results. He feels he is responsible for his own success and is constantly on the lookout for new opportunities. A good boss for this employee understands the politics of getting the job done, knows how to bargain, and is firm but fair.

Level 6 - Sociocentric. A job which allows for the development of friendly relationships with supervisors and others in the work group appeals to this employee. Working with people toward a common goal is more important than getting caught up in a materialistic rat race. He likes a boss who gets people working in close harmony by being more a friendly person than a boss.

Level 7 - Existential. This employee likes a job where the goals and problems are more important than the money, prestige, or how it should be done. He prefers work of his own choosing that offers continuing challenge and requires imagination and initiative. To him, a good boss is one who gives him access to the information he needs and lets him do the job in his own way.

Reproduced from: Flowers, Vincent S. and Charles L. Hughes. "Why Employees Stay". Harvard Business Review. July-August 1973.

METHODOLOGY

Design

This research study was exploratory; this type of study is considered an ex post facto field study by Katz who wrote: "The exploratory study attempts to see what is there rather than to predict the relationships that will be found."[14]

Subjects

The population for this study was the entire professional faculty of the Maryland Cooperative Extension Service, including Extension agents, subject matter specialists, program leaders, supervisors and administrators on active duty between October 1 and November 1, 1976.

Instruments

The two instruments used in this study were the Values for Working questionnaire of Hughes, Flowers, Myers and Myers,[15] and an adaptation of the County Extension Agents' Job Satisfaction Inventory of Calloway.[16]

1. Values for Working questionnaire of Hughes, Flowers, Myers and Myers. Graves' levels of psychological existence was used as a frame of reference to develop research instruments for measuring values in organizations. The Values for Working questionnaire is keyed to workplace attitudes and behavior, and is designed to measure values at levels 2 through 7. Level 1 is not measured since few employees are found at that level.

   The questionnaire was developed by testing experimentally-written items and then refining them through correlational analysis on the basis of internal consistency.[17]

2. Extension Workers' Job Satisfaction Inventory. This instrument is an adaption of Calloway's (1968) County Extension Agents' Job Satisfaction Inventory. Calloway developed a questionnaire that would be appropriate for measurement of job satisfaction of County Extension Agents in the North Carolina Agriculture Extension Service.

   This instrument, with minor changes necessary because of differences in salary and supervisory structure in the Maryland Cooperative Extension Service, was used as a measure of job satisfaction. Some items had phrases inserted in parentheses to adapt the questionnaire to specialists and other state staff.

   The Calloway inventory is based on the Herzberg et al (1964) theory of motivation and nine of the job satisfaction dimensions. These nine dimensions are achievement, recognition, the work itself, advancement, responsibility, organizational policy and administration, supervision, salary and working conditions.

Procedures

The three part questionnaire, I - Biographic, II - Values for Working, III - Job Satisfaction Inventory was pretested and appropriate changes made. Each questionnaire was mailed with a prestamped, addressed envelope.

Analysis

The Statistical Program for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Program was used in data analysis. Computation was accomplished through a grant provided by the Computer Science Center, University of Maryland.

Frequency distribution, percentile distribution and chi square were the methods of analysis; in addition, factor analysis was used to determine the factors present in the Extension Workers' Job Satisfaction Inventory of Maryland Cooperative Extension Service faculty.

Hypotheses

The study was exploratory; no hypotheses were presented. Three questions were asked before analysis:

1. Are there differences of values systems orientations among Maryland Cooperative Extension Service faculty?
2. Are there differences in job satisfaction among Maryland Cooperative Extension Service faculty?
3. Is there a relationship between values systems and job satisfaction among Maryland Cooperative Extension Service faculty?

RESULTS

Two hundred sixty-two subjects responded to the questionnaire, representing a 96.3 percent response as shown in Table 2.

In addition to the SPSS subprogram "Crosstabs", the "Basic" program chi square (CHI -2*) was used as a chi square contingency test to determine the source of association in larger cross tabulations with a significant (.05 level minimum) raw chi square.

Analysis revealed differences in value system orientation and level of job satisfaction among Maryland Extension faculty, and a relationship between work values and job satisfaction.

Factor analysis of job satisfaction indicated eight factors contributing to variance in job satisfaction among Maryland Cooperative Extension Service faculty. The factors were: achievement, supervision, salary, reporting, responsibility, advancement, recognition and working conditions. The work itself and organizational policy and administration were not identified as separate factors.

Table 2. Demographic Data, Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Faculty, 1976, Completing Questionnaires

	No Missing Values (1)	Completed
Present Job Assignment	N=235	N=262
4-H Agent	48	52
Agriculture Agent	36	41
Home Economics Agent	36	42
Community and Resource Development Agent	10	10
State Specialist Faculty	81	91
Administrative-Supervisory	24	26
County Chairpersons	22	24
Non-Chairperson County Faculty	108	115
Years of Employment in Extension		
0 to 1	37	39
2 to 5	71	80
6 to 10	34	37
11 to 15	28	32
16 and over	65	73
Not reported		1
Sex		
Male	163	178
Female	72	84
Age		
Under 30	51	60
30 to 39	56	60
40 to 49	62	68
50 to 59	52	58
60 and over	14	16
Level of Formal Education		
Bachelor's degree	31	32
Bachelor's plus additional hours	52	59
Master's degree	36	41
Master's degree plus additional hours	47	53
Advanced Graduate Specialist	4	6
Doctorate	65	71
Hours of Education or other Behavioral Sciences		
0 to 29	137	153
30 and over	72	82
Not reported	26	27

(1) No missing values in Values for Work portion of questionnaire.

Two items written to measure the reporting function of organizational policy and administration loaded together to form a factor not previously identified as a job satisfaction factor by Herzberg or Calloway.

The items were:

46. The adequacy of the written plan of work, annual reports and statistical reports in reporting your accomplishments.

47. The adequacy of the written plan of work, annual reports and statistical reports in evaluating your accomplishments.

The factor was identified as reporting and kept as a factor in further analysis

The results of the factor analysis support the construct validity of the instrument as a measure of job satisfaction among Extension faculty based on Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory.

Work values of the Maryland Extension faculty were found to be highest in the existential value orientation with a mean of 30.92; followed by sociocentric, 20.02; manipulative, 15.83; conformist, 15.71; tribalistic, 10.24; and egocentric, 3.30.

Distribution of raw scores among the six values systems measured are shown in Table 3.

Results should be interpreted and discussed with the means for the values systems in mind. The Maryland Cooperative Extension Service faculty were found to be predominantly centered in the existential and sociocentric values systems.

Significant results of the job satisfaction, demographic and values systems comparisons are summarized in Tables 4-8. Complete data tables may be seen by contacting the authors.

The administrative-supervisory group were significantly less egocentric than the rest of the faculty and significantly higher in job satisfaction. All other groups of job assignment were significantly lower in satisfaction with the job than the administrative work group. A significant relationship was found in the egocentric values system. Those faculty in the highly egocentric group were significantly less satisfied with the job and with the Herzberg factors of supervision and recognition. Conversely, the administrative group, low in egocentrism, was significantly more satisfied with recognition, supervision, advancement and working conditions than the rest of the faculty.

The 10 community and resource development agents were all in the high group of egocentrism. Seven of the 10 were also found in the low group of job satisfaction. An expected frequency of less than five was found in both comparisons invalidating the chi square statistic; however, a relationship appeared to exist.

As policymakers, the administrative-supervisory group would be expected to be higher in job satisfaction than those of the faculty to whom the policy is directed. Having advanced within the organization, and being responsible for

Table 3. Distribution of Raw Scores Among Six Value Systems Orientation, Maryland Extension Faculty, 1976

Value System[a]	Min	Percentiles									Max	Mean	Median	S.D.
		10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90				
2. Tribalistic	0	3	5	7	8	10	11	12	13	15	34	10.243	10.604	4.873
3. Egocentric	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	3	6	7	20	3.302	2.391	3.503
4. Conformist	0	5	9	11	13	15	16	19	21	25	38	15.711	15.458	7.541
5. Manipulative	0	5	8	10	12	14	16	18	21	27	46	15.826	14.545	8.422
6. Sociocentric	0	9	12	15	17	20	21	24	26	30	48	20.017	19.950	8.326
7. Existential	9	18	22	24	27	30	32	35	38	43	68	30.915	30.000	9.831

(a) Value system numbers and names refer to the Hughes and Flowers inventory, Values for Working. Level 1 (Reactive) is not measured since few workers at that level are found in work situations.

TABLE 4. SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIPS AMONG JOB ASSIGNMENT, WORK VALUES AND JOB SATISFACTION, MARYLAND COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE FACULTY, 1976.

Job Assignment	Work Values System (a)						Job Satisfaction
	2	3	4	5	6	7	
4-H Agents (b)					+ .001		- .03
Agriculture Agents							
Home Economics Agents							
Community and Resource Development Agents		+ .03 (c)					
Specialists and Program Leaders							
Administration and Supervision		- .02					+ .002
4-H Agents (d)		+ .005			+ .008		
County Chairpersons (e)			+ .05				
Non-Chairperson			-				
County Faculty							

(a) Refers to Hughes and Flowers Values of Working:

2 - Tribalistic
3 - Egocentric
4 - Conformist
5 - Manipulative
6 - Sociocentric
7 - Existential

(b) All comparisons are given as compared to rest of the faculty except as otherwise noted.

(c) Less than 5 expected in all.

(d) 4-H Agents compared to administration only.

(e) Key: + indicates significantly greater frequency in higher group than expected.
- indicates significantly greater frequency in lower group than expected.

TABLE 5. SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIPS AMONG YEARS OF EXPERIENCE, SEX AND AGE, WORK VALUES AND JOB SATISFACTION, MARYLAND COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE FACULTY, 1976.

Demography / Years of Experience	Work Values System (a)						Job Satisfaction
	2	3	4	5	6	7	
0-1 Years (b)							
2-5			- .024				
6-10							
11-15			+ .024				
Over 16			+ .008				
Sex: Male (c)	+ .0001		+ .018	+ .03	- .021	- .002	
Female	-		-	-	+	+	
Age: Under 30 years			- .002				
30-39							- .002
40-49			+ .01				
50-59							
Over 60							+ .024

(a) Refers to Hughes and Flowers Values of Working:

2 - Tribalistic
3 - Egocentric
4 - Conformist
5 - Manipulative
6 - Sociocentric
7 - Existential

(b) All comparisons are given as compared to rest of the faculty except as otherwise noted.

(c) Male faculty compared to female faculty

(d) Key: +indicates significantly greater frequency in higher group than expected.
- indicates significantly greater frequency in lower group than expected.

TABLE 6. SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIPS AMONG EDUCATIONAL LEVEL AND HOURS OF BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE COURSES, WORK VALUES AND JOB SATISFACTION, MARYLAND COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE FACULTY, 1976.

Educational Level	Work Values System (a)						Job Satisfaction
	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Bachelor's Degree			- .031		+ .041		
Master's Degree							
Doctorate					- .0071		
Hours of Behavioral Science Course Work Among All Faculty:							
0-29 hours				+ .004		- .005	
Over 30 hours				-		+	
Hours of Behavioral Science Coursework Among Holders of Doctorate:							
0-29 hours				+ .048			
Over 30 hours				-			

(a) Refers to Hughes and Flowers Values of Working:

2 - Tribalistic
3 - Egocentric
4 - Conformist
5 - Manipulative
6 - Sociocentric
7 - Existential

(b) Key: + indicates significantly greater frequency in higher group than expected.
- indicates significantly greater frequency in lower group than expected.

TABLE 7. SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIPS AMONG JOB ASSIGNMENT AND JOB SATISFACTION FACTORS, MARYLAND COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE FACULTY, 1976.

	Job Satisfaction Factors							
Job Assignment	Achievement	Supervision	Salary	Reporting	Responsibility	Advancement	Recognition	Working Conditions
4-H Agent							- .016	- .000005
Agricultural Agent	- .0034							
Home Economics Agent		- .054						
Community and Resource Dev. Agent								+ .032(a)
Specialists and Program Leaders		+ .021						
Administration and Supervision		+ .008				+ .004	+ .012	+ .007

(a) Less than 5 expected in all.

(b) Key: + indicates significantly greater frequency in higher group than expected.
- indicates significantly greater frequency in lower group than expected.

TABLE 8. SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIPS AMONG JOB SATISFACTION FACTORS AND WORK VALUES, MARYLAND COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE FACULTY, 1976.

Value System	Job Satisfaction Factors							
	Achievement	Supervision	Salary	Reporting	Responsibility	Advancement	Recognition	Working Conditions
Existential								
Sociocentric			+ .001					
Manipulative								
Conformist	+ .007							
Egocentric		- .035						
Tribalistic							- .025	

(a) Egocentric was only value system significantly less satisfied with the job (.02 level of significance)

(b) Key: + indicates significantly greater frequency in higher group than expected.
- indicates significantly greater frequency in lower group than expected.

supervision, the administrative-supervisory group would be expected to be higher in thos factors as well.

The data suggest that the egocentric values system was highly related to job satisfaction in the Maryland Extension faculty.

4-H agents were significantly higher in egocentrism as compared to the administrative-supervisory group but not to the rest of the faculty. They were significantly less satisfied with the job and Herzberg factors, working conditions and recognition, than the rest of the faculty. The data again suggest a relationship between egocentrism and job satisfaction.

4-H agents were more sociocentric than the rest of the faculty with the exception of home economics agents and the administrative-supervisory group. The data showed no significant relationship between sociocentrism and job satisfaction. A significant relationship was found between sociocentrism and the salary factor. Those higher in sociocentrism were significantly more satisfied with the salary. Hughes and Flowers' research indicates that sociocentrics seek fulfilling personal interrelationships with others more actively than salary or advancement in the organization. No clear conclusion could be drawn from the data.

Hughes and Flowers' research indicates that differences (disparity) in values system orientation between management and employees will lead to lower job satisfaction. The data suggest there was little disparity of values in the Maryland Cooperative Extension Service, with the possible exception that 4-H agents were significantly higher and the administrative-supervisory staff significantly lower in egocentrism.

Hughes and Flowers' research indicates disparity would exist between highly existential or sociocentric managers and highly egocentric and tribalistic employees. The data support this position. County chairpersons were significantly higher in the conformist value system than non-chairperson county faculty. No significant difference in job satisfaction was found.

No significant difference in value system orientation or job satisfaction was found among agriculture science agents. Agriculture science agents were significantly more satisfied with the Herzberg achievement factor than the rest of the faculty.

Home economics agents were significantly less satisfied with the supervision factor, but not with the job. No significant difference in work values systems were found in home economics agents compared to the rest of the faculty.

Sex differences were more apparent, however. Females were significantly more existential and sociocentric than males. Males were significantly more conformist, manipulative and tribalistic. No significant difference was found in job satisfaction between sexes.

No significant differences in values systems were found operating in the specialists. No significant difference in job satisfaction was found in specialists as compared to the rest of the faculty. Specialists were significantly more satisfied with the supervision factor than the rest of the faculty.

Significant differences in work values but not job satisfaction were found when educational level was analyzed. Those faculty with bachelor's degrees only were more sociocentric and less conformist. Those faculty with doctorates were significantly lower in sociocentrism. No significant differences were found among master's degree holders.

There was a significant difference in values system orientation between those faculty with 29 or fewer semester hours of behavioral science formal coursework as compared to those with 30 or more. Those faculty with less behavioral science training were more manipulative. Those with more behavioral science training were more existential. Behavioral science training would be expected to relate more to sociocentrism than to existentialism.

The relationship of values systems to behavioral science training among doctorate holders was analyzed. Doctorate holders with less than 30 hours of behavioral science training were significantly higher in the manipulative values system. Hughes and Flowers' research indicates a tendency for technically-oriented scientists to be more centered in the manipulative values systems. The data support this finding. No significant differences in job satisfaction were found associated with behavioral science training.

Significant differences in values system orientation were found in two age groups. Those faculty less than 30 years of age were significantly less conformist, and those 40-49 years of age were significantly more conformist. The data agrees with that of the work values cross-tabulation with years of Extension experience. Those faculty with 2-5 years of Extension experience were significantly less conformist. Those with 11-15 and 16 or more years of experience were significantly more conformist.

The data suggest that faculty become more conformist the longer they stay with the organization. Some of the less conformist faculty may have left the organization at an earlier time.

No significant difference in job satisfaction was found in analysis of years of Extension experience. Significant differences in job satisfaction were found in two age groups, however. Those faculty 30-39 years of age were significantly less satisfied, and those 60 years or older were significantly more satisfied than the rest of the faculty. The data suggest that faculty tended to become more conformist with increasing age and also to have higher job satisfaction.

This suggestions was further supported when faculty with high and low conformist values were crosstabulated with the Herzberg factors of job satisfaction. Those faculty higher in the conformist value system were significantly more satisfied with the achievement factor. No significant association was found among the conformist work value system and other Herzberg factors, or satisfaction with the job.

In summary, the data indicate there were significant differences in values system orientation and level of job satisfaction among Maryland Extension faculty. A significant relationship exists between the egocentric values system and job satisfaction.

The data appear to support the research of Hughes and Flowers that disparity of value systems would decrease job satisfaction.

Implications

The following general implications are made based on the reported research:

1. Work values need to be recognized as a possible source of dissatisfaction in the Maryland Cooperative Extension Service.

2. Consideration should be given to having administrative-supervisory faculty participate in training programs to help them understand the problems of potential disparity of values systems. Management should be prepared to adapt organizational goals to people with values systems different from their own.

3. Primary sources of dissatisfaction among various job assignments appear to be related to supervision in home economics agents, and working conditions and recognition in 4-H and youth agents. Salary and reporting appear to be common dissatisfying factors. The dissatisfying factors need to be recognized and attenuated where possible.

Recommendations for Further Research

Based on the review of literature and the research reported, the following recommendations for further research are suggested.

1. That further research concerning work values and job satisfaction be conducted with a larger number of administrative staff, supervisory staff and department heads and with a stratified sample of Extension managers and employees in selected demographic classifications from the state Extension population.

2. That further research be conducted to determine the source of job dissatisfaction among 4-H and youth agents to reduce resignations.

3. That research be conducted on the relationship of work values in agent to clientele interaction.

4. That research be conducted on the relationship of work values to race in both faculty and agent to client interactions.

5. That further research be conducted to determine the source of dissatisfaction of home economics agents with the Herzberg factor of supervision.

6. That further research be conducted to determine the source of dissatisfaction of 4-H agents with the factors of working conditions and recognition.

7. That the Calloway inventory and adaptation be further tested for reliability and validity with revisions to increase validity for use with both county and state faculty.

8. That further research be conducted to determine the predictability of job satisfaction from values system orientation, especially the egocentric values system.

9. That further research be conducted to determine the source of variance in the Herzberg achievement factor.

LITERATURE CITED

[1]Hughes, Charles L. and Vincent S. Flowers. "Toward Existentialism in Management". The Conference Board Record, XII: 60-64. September 1975.

[2]Amend, Edwin H. "Supervision: Motivating, Not Controlling". Journal of Extension, VIII: 17-24. Winter 1970.

[3]Ibid., p. 19.

[4]King, Emily E. "Relationships of Personal Value Systems to a Measure of Job Satisfaction Among Personnel of the Florida Agricultural Extension Service". (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Wisconsin), 1961.

[5]Bruce, Robert L. and G.L. Carter, Jr. "Administrative Climate" Journal of Cooperative Extension, V: 7-14. Spring 1976. p. 9.

[6]Baier, Kurt. "The Concept of Value". Value Theory in Philosophy and Social Science, Ervin Lazlow and James B. Wilbur, editors, (Gordon and Breach Science Publishers), p. 1. 1973.

[7]Baier. Op. cit., p. 4.

[8]Rokeach, Milton. The Nature of Human Values. (New York: The Free Press, MacMillan), p. 5. 1973.

[9]Hughes, Charles L. and Vincent S. Flowers. "Shaping Personnel Strategies to Disparate Value Systems". Personnel, p. 11. March-April 1973.

[10]Herzberg, F., B. Mausner, and B.F. Snyderman. Motivation to Work. (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.), 1964.

[11]Graves, Clare W. "Levels of Existence: An Open System Theory of Values". Journal of Humanistic Psychology, X: 131-155. 1970.

[12]Hughes and Flowers. Personnel. Op. cit., pp. 15-19.

[13]Hughes, Charles L. and Vincent S. Flowers. "New Goals in Personnel". Management by Objectives Journal, Surry, England, 3(4): 26. 1974.

[14]Katz, Daniel. "Field Studies". Research Methods in the Behavioral Sciences, L. Festinger and D. Katz, editors. (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston), p. 74. 1952.

[15]Flowers, Vincent S., Charles L. Hughes, M. Scott Myers and Susan Myers. "Managerial Values for Working". AMACOM, A Division of American Management Association, p. 14, 1975.

[16]Calloway, Pauline Frances. "An Analysis of Construct Validity of Motivation as it Relates to North Carolina County Agriculture Extension Service Agents". (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, North Carolina State University). 1968.

[17]Flowers, Hughes, Myers and Myers. AMACOM. p. 14.